IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

MONDAY, THE 19TH MARCH 2007 / 28TH PHALGUNA 1928

RP.No. 876 of 2006(D) IN W.P. (C) NO.18725 OF 2004

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.18725/2004 Dated 06/07/2006

.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONER IN W.P.(C)

K.SREENIVASAN,
ASSISTANT MANAGER-CASH,
STATE BANK OF INDIA, KONGORAPILLY BRANCH,
ERNAKULAM (NOW POSTED AT AMBALAMEDU BRANCH).

BY ADV. SRI.S.MOHANDAS

RESPONDENTS: COUNTER PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS IN W.P.(C)

---

1. CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER,
PERSONNEL & H.R.D.
STATE BANK OF INDIA, ZONAL OFFICE,
ERNAKULAM.

2. CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER,
SBI LOCAL OFFICE, TRIVANDRUM.
(LOCAL HEAD OFFICE OF SBI).

3. CHAIRMAN, INDIAN BANKS' ASSOCIATION
BLOCK NO.2 & 3, STADIUM HOUSE,
5TH FLOOR, NEAR NARIMAN ROAD,
MUMBAI 400 020.

4. UNION OF INDIA REPRESENTED BY
SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA,
MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL & TRAINING,
NEW DELHI.

BY ADV. SRI.P.G.PARAMESWARA PANICKER (SR.)
SRI.P.GOPAL,SC FOR SBI.

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 19/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

R.P.No.876 of 2006 in W.P.(C).No.18725 of 2004

Dated this the 19th day of March, 2007

O R D E R

Heard. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that while disposing of the writ petition, this Court did not consider prayer Nos.1 and 5. The other prayers are covered by the judgment of this Court in O.P.No.9752 of 2002. The first prayer relates to eligibility criteria fixed for candidates to be considered under the Fast Track Channel for promotion to MMG-II. Since ..... will substantially redress the grievance of candidates, I think it is not proper for this Court to interfere with the minimum marks fixed for candidates coming under the Fast Track Channel for the reason that they belong to Scheduled Caste Scheduled Tribes. The first prayer cannot be granted and it was unnecessary in view of the direction in the above said O.P. I did not specifically deal with prayer No.1 while disposing of the writ petition since the petitioner has specifically .....In this review petition, it is ordered that the said prayer cannot be granted and it is unnecessary to grant the said prayer in view of the direction to make a provision for reservation in the matter of promotion to MMG-II. It is unnecessary to grant prayer No.5 because the said prayer is meant to enable this Court to get the materials to adjudicate in appeal. Since the claim has already been adjudicated, it is unnecessary to call for the records mentioned in prayer No.5.

In the result, the Review Petition fails, and it is dismissed.

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, JUDGE.

MS